

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

CHEYENNE C. HARDING,  
Plaintiff,  
-against-  
STATE OF NEW YORK; TROOPER  
FINNEGAN; INVESTIGATORS TIMOTHY P.  
GOULD; WOLLMAN; OTHER STATE  
POLICE EMPLOYEES IN THEIR  
INDIVIDUAL AND OFFICIAL CAPACITIES,  
Defendants.

USDC SDNY  
DOCUMENT  
ELECTRONICALLY FILED  
DOC #: \_\_\_\_\_  
DATE FILED: 8/8/2022

22-CV-6285 (NSR)

ORDER OF SERVICE

NELSON S. ROMÁN, United States District Judge:

Plaintiff, who is appearing *pro se*, brings this action under the Court's federal question jurisdiction and diversity of citizenship jurisdiction, alleging that Defendants violated her federal constitutional rights. The Court construes the complaint as asserting constitutional claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and claims under state law. Named as Defendants are the State of New York, New York State Trooper Timothy H. Finnegan, New York State Police Investigators Timothy P. Gould and James Wollman, and "other State Police employees." By order dated July 25, 2022, the Court granted Plaintiff's request to proceed *in forma pauperis* ("IFP"), that is, without prepayment of fees.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

The Court must dismiss an IFP complaint, or portion thereof, that is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B); *see Livingston v. Adirondack Beverage Co.*, 141 F.3d 434, 437 (2d Cir. 1998). The Court must also dismiss a complaint when the Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction. *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3)*. While

the law mandates dismissal on any of these grounds, the Court is obliged to construe *pro se* pleadings liberally, *Harris v. Mills*, 572 F.3d 66, 72 (2d Cir. 2009), and interpret them to raise the “strongest [claims] that they suggest,” *Triestman v. Fed. Bureau of Prisons*, 470 F.3d 471, 474 (2d Cir. 2006) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted) (emphasis in original).

## DISCUSSION

### **A. Claims against the State of New York**

The Court must dismiss Plaintiff’s claims against the State of New York. “[A]s a general rule, state governments may not be sued in federal court unless they have waived their Eleventh Amendment immunity, or unless Congress has abrogated the states’ Eleventh Amendment immunity . . . .” *Gollomp v. Spitzer*, 568 F.3d 355, 366 (2d Cir. 2009). “The immunity recognized by the Eleventh Amendment extends beyond the states themselves to state agents and state instrumentalities that are, effectively, arms of a state.” *Id.* New York has not waived its Eleventh Amendment immunity to suit in federal court, and Congress did not abrogate the states’ immunity in enacting 42 U.S.C. § 1983. *See Trotman v. Palisades Interstate Park Comm’n*, 557 F.2d 35, 40 (2d Cir. 1977). The Court therefore dismisses Plaintiff’s claims against the State of New York because Plaintiff seeks monetary relief from a defendant that is immune from such relief and, therefore, the Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(iii); Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3); *see Close v. New York*, 125 F.3d 31, 38-39 (2d Cir. 1997) (“[U]nless New York waived its immunity, the district court lacked subject matter jurisdiction.”).

## B. Service on Remaining Named Defendants

Because Plaintiff has been granted permission to proceed IFP, she is entitled to rely on the Court and the U.S. Marshals Service to effect service.<sup>1</sup> *Walker v. Schult*, 717 F.3d. 119, 123 n.6 (2d Cir. 2013); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d) (“The officers of the court shall issue and serve all process . . . in [IFP] cases.”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(c)(3) (the court must order the Marshals Service to serve if the plaintiff is authorized to proceed IFP)).

To allow Plaintiff to effect service on Defendants Timothy H. Finnegan, Timothy P. Gould, and James Wollman through the U.S. Marshals Service, the Clerk of Court is instructed to fill out a U.S. Marshals Service Process Receipt and Return form (“USM-285 form”) for these Defendants. The Clerk of Court is further instructed to issue summonses and deliver to the Marshals Service all the paperwork necessary for the Marshals Service to effect service upon Defendants.

If the complaint is not served within 90 days after the date the summonses are issued, Plaintiff should request an extension of time for service. *See Meilleur v. Strong*, 682 F.3d 56, 63 (2d Cir. 2012) (holding that it is the plaintiff’s responsibility to request an extension of time for service).

Plaintiff must notify the Court in writing if her address changes, and the Court may dismiss the action if Plaintiff fails to do so.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Although Rule 4(m) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure generally requires that summonses be served within 90 days of the date the complaint is filed, Plaintiff is proceeding IFP and could not have served summonses and the complaint until the Court reviewed the complaint and ordered that summonses be issued. The Court therefore extends the time to serve until 90 days after the date summonses are issued.

<sup>2</sup> Because Plaintiff provides no identifying information as to “other State Police employees” she names as defendants and alleges no facts explaining how they were personally and directly involved in the events giving rise to her claims, the Court declines to issue an order under *Valentin v. Dinkins*, 121 F.3d 72, 76 (2d Cir. 1997), as to these defendants at this time.

**C. Request for *Pro Bono* Counsel**

Plaintiff also filed an application for the Court to request *pro bono* counsel. The factors to be considered in ruling on an indigent litigant's request for counsel include the merits of the case, Plaintiff's efforts to obtain a lawyer, and Plaintiff's ability to gather the facts and present the case if unassisted by counsel. *See Cooper v. A. Sargent Co.*, 877 F.2d 170, 172 (2d Cir. 1989); *Hodge v. Police Officers*, 802 F.2d 58, 60-62 (2d Cir. 1986). Of these, the merits are “[t]he factor which command[s] the most attention.” *Cooper*, 877 F.2d at 172. Because it is too early in the proceedings for the Court to assess the merits of the action, Plaintiff's motion for counsel (ECF 4) is denied without prejudice to renewal at a later date.

**CONCLUSION**

The Court dismisses Plaintiff's claims against the State of New York because Plaintiff seeks monetary relief from a defendant that is immune from such relief and, therefore, the Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(iii); Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3).

The Clerk of Court is instructed to complete the USM-285 forms with the addresses for Timothy H. Finnegan, Timothy P. Gould, and James Wollman, and deliver all documents necessary to effect service to the U.S. Marshals Service.

The Court denies Plaintiff's application for the Court to request *pro bono* counsel (ECF 4) without prejudice to renewal at a later date.

The Court certifies under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that any appeal from this order would not be taken in good faith, and therefore IFP status is denied for the purpose of an appeal. Cf. *Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962) (holding that an appellant demonstrates good faith when he seeks review of a nonfrivolous issue).

The Clerk of Court is also directed to mail an information package to Plaintiff.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 8, 2022  
White Plains, New York



---

NELSON S. ROMÁN  
United States District Judge

**DEFENDANTS AND SERVICE ADDRESSES**

1. Timothy H. Finnegan, Badge #404  
New York State Police  
295 Route 100  
Somers, NY 10589
2. Timothy P. Gould  
New York State Police  
295 Route 100  
Somers, NY 10589
3. James Wollman  
New York State Police  
295 Route 100  
Somers, NY 10589